

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-19 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-20 are rejected by the Examiner.
- Claim 10 is amended by the Applicant.
- Claim 20 is cancelled by Applicant.

Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9-11, 13-14, and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,185 to Chu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,511 to Liu et al. (Lin). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Chu discloses a personal computer system comprising two physically separate units and the interconnection between them. As stated in Chu col. 2 lines 37-43:

“The first unit, an attached computing module (ACM), contains the core computing power and environment for a computer user. The second unit, a peripheral console (PCON), contains the power supply and primary input and output devices for the computer system. An ACM and a PCON are coupled with one another to form a fully functional personal computer system.” (Chu, col. 2, lines 37-43)

The Office Action dated 8/4/06 on page 3 states:

“Chu fails to teach that the docking station enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station. Lin et al. teaches the conventionality of having a communication interface enabled to acquire information from an external computer (Column 6, Lines 22-27).” (Office Action, page 3)

Applicant agrees that Chu fails to teach the Claim 1 element “wherein the docking station is itself mobile, has no local host computer core when the mobile computer is

uninstalled, and enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station...”. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees that Lin teaches above recited element that is not taught in Chu.

Applicant notes that the above-recited element of Claim 1 indicates a condition that is unique to the current invention. The unique condition is that when the docking station does not have the mobile computer installed, that is, when the docking station is absent a local host computer core, the docking station is able to use its communications interface to acquire and display information from an external computer. This capability to acquire and display the information from an external computer is present even when the mobile computer is not in communication with the docking station. Stated a different way, when a mobile computer is not installed and is also not communicating with the docking station (example: the mobile computer is not in the docking station and the mobile computer is turned off and put away), the docking station both acquires and displays information from an external computer even though the docking station has no local host computer.

Chu does not disclose the capability of the PCON 200 to acquire and display information from an external computer when the ACM 100 is both uninstalled and where the ACM 100 is not in communication with the PCON 200.

Liu also fails to teach the element of “wherein the docking station is itself mobile, has no local host computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled, and enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station...”.

Liu teaches a technique for calibrating non-reference printers to a reference printer in a network system. As stated in at col 3, lines 59-63:

“One aspect of the invention involves a method for calibrating one or more non-reference imaging devices to a reference imaging device, where the imaging

devices are preferably printers of the same type and more preferably of the same model.” (Liu col. 3, lines 59-63)

With the aid of Figure 1, Liu describes the architecture of the controlling device which is used in the calibration technique at col. 5, lines 7-23:

“FIG. 1 illustrates major components in a network color image reproduction system constructed in accordance with the invention. Input device 10 receives from path 11 signals representing an original image and generates along path 12 an input-device-dependent representation of the original image. Controlling device 20 receives this representation from path 12 and, in response, generates along paths 31A, 31B and 31C output-device-dependent representations of the original image. Output devices 30A, 30B and 30C receive this representation from paths 31A, 31B and 31C respectively and, in response, generate along paths 32A, 32B and 32C individual replicas of the original image. The present invention is directed toward a self-calibration technique for eliminating or minimizing variations in the output images produced by the different output devices 30A, 30B and 30C in response to the same input signal 12.” (Liu, col 5, lines 7-23)

Liu states that the component of Figure 1 may be used in the computer system of Figure 2 at col. 6 lines 1-5:

“Controlling device 20 may be implemented by software and/or hardware in a general-purpose computer such as that illustrated in FIG. 2, which is a functional block diagram of one embodiment of a typical personal computer system 40. CPU 42 provides computing resources.” (Liu, col. 6, lines 1-5)

Applicant concludes that the controlling device 20 is used in a computing system which actually has a CPU 42 to provide computing resources. This is in distinction to pending Claim 1 which recites “wherein the docking station is itself mobile, has no local host computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled, and enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without

communications with the docking station...”. Applicant notes that even though Liu at col. 6, lines 22-29 discloses a communications interface 54 in Figure 2, Liu does not disclose that the communication interface operates to acquire and display information from an external computer when no local host computer core is present (such as the CPU 42 in Figure 2 of Liu). Accordingly, Liu teaches away from the above-recited element of Claim 1 because Liu discloses the use of local host computer core 42 in conjunction with communication interface 54.

Applicant notes that the features of a mobile docking station that has no local computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled, and where the mobile docking station enables the communications interface to support communication with an external computer when the mobile station is uninstalled, is present in both independent Claims 1 and 10 of the pending application.

Applicant respectfully submits that a prima facie case of obviousness per 35 U.S.C §103(a) has not been established because all elements are not found in the cited art per MPEP §2143.03. Applicant note that neither Chu nor Liu, considered either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention recited in independent Claims 1 and 10. Specifically, neither Chu nor Liu, considered either alone or in combination, teach or suggest that a mobile docking station enables the communication interface to acquire and display information of an external computer when the local host computer core, which is part of a removable mobile computer, is removed from the docking station. As such, the combination of Chu and Liu do not render independent Claims 1 and 10 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) because all elements are not found in the cited art.

Similarly, Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend on independent Claim 1 and likewise patentably define over the cited art. Claims 11- and 13-19 depend on independent Claim 10 and thus also patentably define over the cited art. Applicant cancels Claim 20. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all pending claims.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,185 to Chu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,511 to Liu et al. (Lin) and in further view of U.S. Pat No. 6,285,911 to Watts, Jr. et al. (Watts). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As stated above with respect to the independent Claims 1 and 10, the combination of Chu and Liu fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicant submits that the addition of Watts also fails to teach the element of “wherein the docking station is itself mobile, has no local host computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled, and enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station...”.

Applicant notes that the docking station 10 of Watts fails to acquire and display information from an external computer when the notebook 13 is not installed.

Therefore Applicant submits that the combination of Chu, Liu, and Watts fails to teach all elements of independent Claim 1 or dependent Claim 7. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 7 because all elements are not taught in the cited references and Claim 7 thus patentably defines over the cited art.

Claims 15-18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,185 to Chu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,511 to Liu et al. (Lin) and in further view of U.S. Pat No. 6,342,901 to Adler et al. (Adler). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As stated above with respect to the independent Claims 1 and 10, the combination of Chu and Liu fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicant submits that the addition of Adler also fails to teach the element of “wherein the docking station is itself mobile, has no local host computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled, and enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station...”.

Therefore Applicant submits that the combination of Chu, Liu, and Adler fails to teach all elements of independent Claim 10 or dependent Claims 15-18. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 15-18 because all elements are not taught in the cited references and Claims 15-18 thus patentably define over the cited art.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,185 to Chu in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,404,511 to Liu et al. (Lin) and in further view of U.S. Pat. Publication No. US2002/0065902 to Janik et al. (Janik). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As stated above with respect to the independent Claims 1 and 10, the combination of Chu and Liu fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicant submits that the addition of Janik also fails to teach the element of “wherein the docking station is itself mobile, has no local host computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled, and enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station...”.

Therefore Applicant submits that the combination of Chu, Liu, and Janik fails to teach all elements of independent Claim 11 or dependent Claim 19. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 19 because all elements are not taught in the cited references and Claim 19 thus patentably defines over the cited art.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chu in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Some of the teachings of Chu are provided above. AAPA in paragraph 0002 of Applicants specification discusses a Microsoft® smart display. However, the combination of Chu and AAPA does not disclose a mobile computer comprising a handheld computer having an integral display as recited in amended Claim 10 and as shown in Figures 2 and 3 and described in paragraph 0003 of Applicants as-filed specification.

Since the combination of Chu and AAPA does not disclose all of the elements of amended Claim 10, Applicant submits that the combination of Chu and AAPA fails to teach all elements of independent Claim 10 and dependent Claims 11, and 13-19. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 10

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-1973/304061.1
Application No.: 10/621,286
Office Action Dated: August 4, 2006

PATENT

because all elements are not taught in the cited references Claim 10 thus patentably defines over the cited art.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and request reconsideration because the pending claims patentably define over the cited art. The Examiner is earnestly asked to contact the undersigned directly at (215) 557-5949 to help resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 3, 2006

\Jerome G. Schaefer\

Jerome G. Schaefer
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439